

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XL

APRIL 22, 1942

No. 944

The Church and the Jews

ARTHUR H. RYAN, D.D., D.PH.

Reprinted from STUDIES (Dublin)

FOR centuries Israel has passed through periods of bitter wandering and persecution darker than the most morbid imaginations of fiction. But through it all the Jews have stood irrepressible, proud, tenacious, preserving their religion and their traditions.

The world today is no less, but rather more, conscious of the Jews than ever, and its reactions to what is called the "Jewish problem" are no less, but rather more, conflicting than ever. From one side you will hear that there is no such thing as a Jewish problem at all—any more than there is a Catholic or a Protestant problem; that the Jews are one religious body among thousands and that there would be no trouble if people would simply leave them alone. At the opposite pole, others maintain that not only is there a problem, but that it is a problem so vast and dangerous that there is no solution for it but extermination or persecution. Not so virulent, others assert that the problem is one of international finance and commercial dishonesty; others that it is a question of

Freemasonry and political intrigue; others that it is a question of social revolution and Bolshevism, and so on.

IS THERE A JEWISH PROBLEM?

I shall try to discuss whether there is a problem and, if so, what is its nature, and to suggest, in the light of Catholic principles and of common sense, the steps that governments or individuals, and the Jews themselves, might take to remove the recurrent and disastrous frictions.

The first position we meet is that there is no Jewish problem at all. This was the official attitude taken up by the majority of Western European States since the time of the French Revolution. It was received with particular enthusiasm in Victorian England and was hailed as the great triumph of liberal thought. Jewry, it was maintained, was just a religion like any other, and religion was a private affair. The advance of free-thought, the establishment of the lay state, had successfully weaned Europeans away from their old religious antagonisms; and just as Protestants and Catholics no longer murdered each other for the love of God, so, now that they were emancipated from clerical and theological dictation, people would cease harrying the Jews.

This policy worked so well for a time—almost for a century—in Western Europe, that it is not surprising that it won many adherents. But it was based on a foreshortening of history. Moreover, in the ramp against ecclesiastical and clerical influence it was forgotten that the Jewish problem does not affect Christian peoples only. For the Jewish *diaspora*, the dispersal of the Jews throughout the world, did not begin with the fall of Jerusalem to Titus or with the Triumph of Christianity. On the contrary, Christianity itself spread *through* the already existing *diaspora*.

By the time of Christ the majority of the Jews were already living outside Palestine; and it has been estimated that they numbered eight or nine millions. The Apostles and their successors made their contacts through the Jewish communities throughout the Empire—in Ephesus, Antioch, Alexandria, Corinth, Athens, Naples, Rome.

Before Christianity was heard of, then, there was a Jewish problem and it was acute. There is the famous speech, the *Pro Flacco*, defending Flaccus from a charge of injustice against the Jews, in which Cicero tells how he found it necessary to lower his voice in the Roman Forum itself lest the Jews should riot.

"You know how numerous these gentry are," he said, "how they cling together and what pressure they bring to bear in assemblies." It sounds like a passage from *Mein Kampf*.

What is true of the pagan Roman Empire is true also of Islam. In Morocco, not so long ago, a Jew had not only to wear a special badge, but to turn his face to the wall if a Mohammedan magnate passed by him.

Finally, in Western Europe itself the old liberal pretense that there was no problem has proved a complete failure, and the age-old experience of every other community has asserted itself again—most of all in circles where Christianity counts for very little. The growth of Jewish numbers and the spread of Jewish influence smashed the pretense. It was possible to keep up this polite fiction when there were only a very few Jewish figures of importance, not too well known to the general public; but it became impossible to keep it up in view of the huge influx of Jews into London, New York, Frankfurt, Berlin, Vienna, Paris; in view of the fact of Jewish Prime Ministers in England and France, of Jewish Mayors in New York and in Rome itself; in view of their business monopolies, of their preponderating interest in the professions, in press and stage and the motion picture industry, on

the turf and in boxing circles, as agitators, politicians, etc.

TOWARDS ANTI-SEMITISM

Today history has taken a terrible revenge on the false pretenses of Liberalism. The wheel has turned full circle, and there is in many countries a large and increasing swing over towards the opposite extreme, towards what is called anti-Semitism.

The word "anti-Semitism" is as grotesque and misleading as the thing—or as its opposite and no less pestiferous "ism," Aryanism. The word "Semite," like the word "Aryan," is largely a philological term; it refers to linguistic groups and has in itself little or nothing to do with religion or race. The ancient Carthaginians were Semites, and so are the modern Arabs; but anti-Semitism does not include them. Nevertheless the word, ugly and misleading as it is, has been sanctioned by usage; everybody knows what it means, and we adopt it for the sake of convenience.

Anti-Semitism is purely and simply hatred of the Jews as such, with all the gradations of passion and violence and slander that hatred can engender—and with one end in view, the elimination of the Jews, if not completely, then from the immediate surroundings. Whether it takes the form of the calculated and organized brutality of Dr. Julius Streicher or Klu-Klux-Klan, or the spontaneous violence of infuriated mobs, it is the same in essence and inspiration. Its usual themes are that Israel is conspiring to overthrow the world and reduce it to slavery; that it aims at corrupting and subverting Christianity morally; that the Jews are gluttoned with gold and that Jewish finance is strangling the human race; that they are guilty of ritual murder; that they foster the white-slave traffic; that they are the power behind Bolshevism, Freemasonry, munition factories, and what not—that they

are, in a word, responsible for every crime and every misery, and that all would be well with humanity if we could have done once for all with this diabolical race.

Needless to say, in the mouth of any Christian anti-Semitism is deplorable and contemptible. To use violence or to provoke violence against a Jew because he is a Jew is, of course, treachery to Christ; and to bear false witness is to break a Divine commandment. Consequently, it goes without saying that no Catholic can be an anti-Semite. (If ecclesiastical decisions are looked for, one can find them in a decree of the Holy Office of December 24, 1928, and in a document of the Congregation of Studies, April 13, 1938.)

The charge has been made that the Church itself has been perilously near to anti-Semitism and has more than once persecuted the Jews. But whatever sins have been committed by Catholics against the Jews (and they are many and grave), the Church itself has never been guilty. Some Popes, like Paul IV, were unkind to them; but the vast majority of the Popes have defended them—especially against the absurd accusations of ritual murder and slanderous forgeries like "The Protocols of Zion." Those who have doubts on the matter can dissipate them by reading the great Jewish historians themselves, like Graetz (no friend of Christians) or Deutsch.

THE POPES AND THE JEWS

The treatment of Jews in the Papal States was not always what we should like it to have been; but it was always better than anywhere else in the world, except in Ireland, which alone of Western European nations is free from the reproach of inhumanity to them. The Popes constantly rebuked those over-zealous Christians who forcibly baptized Jews, or the persecutors who robbed and harried them.

The names of Gregory the Great, Alexander II, Gregory IX, Innocent IV, Boniface VIII, Sixtus V, Pius IX—these are bright lights against the surrounding darkness; and these are only a few of the long line of Papal protectors of the Jews gloriously coming down to Pius XI, who gave the eternal formula of it all in the words: *Noi siamo spiritualmente Semiti*—"We Catholics are spiritual Semites." And how could it be otherwise? How could we hate and despise the rock from which we are hewn? Or raise our hands in violence against the descendants of a race whom God singled out as His chosen people, of a race who gave us our Divine Lord, the most perfect of Jews, His Blessed Mother, the flower of the race, the Apostles and the early Popes? Any Christian who persecutes a Jew on any plea, and especially on the plea that his ancestors crucified Christ, is deaf to the words of Christ crucified Himself: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

Not only does anti-Semitism stand condemned by every test of faith and humanity; it stands condemned also by failure to achieve its own end. For it is the paradox of anti-Semitism that it always strengthens the Jew by strengthening his religious consciousness. Never has violence failed so signally as in his case. Anti-Semitism achieves nothing but the untold suffering of the oppressed and the brutalization of the oppressor.

It would be folly to shut our eyes to the fact of anti-Semitism just because we deplore its existence. To defeat it, it is not enough to denounce it. We must examine and expose some of the charges on which it rests.

JEWISH RICHES

It is quite simple to dispose of many of them. Take the outcry against Jewish riches. The Jews are one of

the poorest people on the face of the earth. For half-a-dozen financiers you can point to half-a-dozen millions of poor Jews living on the verge of starvation. That is not so obvious to us, who have no parallel to the huge ghettos of eastern Europe. Indeed one of the commonest of Jewish complaints against the Gentiles is precisely that he is ground down in poverty.

In answer to this it is sometimes said that you never see a poor Jewish laborer or blacksmith or farmer, and that there is a far greater proportion of successful business-men amongst the Jews than in any other community. That is true; but why is it true? It is true because for centuries the Jew was not allowed to own land or enter a closed craft or a profession, and consequently he had no means of making a living except through business, whether small peddling or big commerce or money-lending. It is not, therefore, surprising if he excelled in business; nor is it fair to blame him for being successful at the only thing he was allowed to do.

Still it would be quite disingenuous to suggest that there is nothing at all in the complaints about Jewish financial practices. The preponderance of Jews in international finance, in money-lending, (the charge of usury against them runs with monotonous regularity throughout the centuries), their battenning on unpaid insurance premiums, their taking advantage of bankruptcy laws—these things cannot be dismissed as absolutely without foundation. But the point nearly always overlooked is this: that the Jews are by no means the only people guilty of such things; and consequently to put these abominations down to "the Jews" as such is a libel. That some Jews are guilty of usury is true. But so are many Gentiles. That some Jews pursue shady business methods and take advantage of bankruptcy laws and lapsed premiums is true. But so do many Gentiles.

The proper course to take in these matters, instead

of uselessly dissipating our energies and emotions by making scapegoats of the Jews, is to attack the causes. If usury is an abomination, why attack the Jews only? Why not attack the laws that allow anybody, whether Jew or Gentile, to practise it? If the bankruptcy laws allow of injustice and evasion, the laws rather than the Jews should be the object of censure and reform. If Protestants or Catholics make fortunes out of rack-renting tenements or doubtful instalment methods, nobody shouts "Away with Protestants" or "Away with Catholics." They shout "Away with the laws that allow such things." Why should we act otherwise with the Jews? For the unscrupulous Gentile will take advantage of these opportunities as well as the unscrupulous Jew. We shall not get rid of these troubles by persecuting the Jews; for there will be many only too ready to take their place. We shall solve them only by transforming the social and economic structure so that it will render such crimes impossible for anyone, no matter who he may be or whence he may come.

THE JEW IS INTERNATIONAL

Am I then suggesting that the Jew really is like everybody else, and putting forward under another guise the Liberal conception I have already been at pains to demolish? No; and here, I think, we come to the root of the question. For when we are talking of virtues or faults in others, we talk in terms of nationalities: of Englishmen, Americans, Frenchmen, Italians. But in the case of the Jew we are talking, not of a national, but of an international community; not of a people rooted and at home in one place, but of a people uprooted and at home nowhere. For example, there are American, English and French millionaires. But who else than the Jews could produce a family like the Rothschilds, with five millionaire brothers or cousins

dominating finance, not in one country, but in the five great capitals of Europe?

Where else would we hear so frequently of a university professor in London who has a brother a Communist leader in Moscow, another a banker in Frankfurt, and a third a bookmaker in New York? It may not be fair to blame any of these for the position or power of the others. But the emigrants of every other nation either become absorbed in their new surroundings or remain as they were. Everywhere the Jew is a Jew. He is not national; he is international. He is not fixed; he is "déraciné"; he is ready to take up his tent-pegs at any moment and settle somewhere else. This, it seems to me, is the root of the trouble.

Normally the nation contains the family. But with the Jews the family is scattered among the nations; and since family ties are stronger, more intimate and more personal than national ties, this means that the Jew is an alien body in every nation. To quote a distinguished Jewish authority, Rabbi B. J. Solomons (at Montefiore College, Ramsgate, April 5, 1908): "We form a nation within a nation in whatever land we pitch our tents. With few exceptions, we intermarry amongst ourselves and thus maintain the purity of our race; and our internal laws and religious tenets tend to preserve the peculiar individuality of our people."

Now, just as in an organism an alien body irritates, so does an alien community in a country—especially an alien community of people like the Jews whose history is absolutely unique, whose talents are unquestionable, and whose religious and racial conservatism is extraordinarily tenacious. When the gifts and traditional training of the Jews are such that with comparative ease, though a minority, they succeed in obtaining an outstanding place in business, in the various professions, in politics, and particularly in finance, the other members of the community begin to

ask themselves: "Who is the master here? Is it the Jews or ourselves? Is this to be tolerated in our own household?"

At first the protest is raised in all sincerity; and there are reasonable ways of meeting it. But if the reasonable way is not taken, then sooner or later the protest asserts itself in one of those pogroms that have sullied the pages of history from ancient Rome to modern Germany: thousands of innocent Jews, old and young, men and women and children, are insulted and pillaged and beaten and massacred.

A JEWISH STATE

The first fact to face then is that the Jews are an alien community wherever they are; and consequently it is a source of constant danger to the Jews themselves if they do not recognize this fact and act upon it. How are they to act upon it? I see only two possibilities: first, the formation of a Jewish State which will act as fatherland; secondly, the formation of legally recognized and protected Jewish groups within other communities. The first way, the erection of a Jewish State, is the way of Zionism.

Zionism was born by the disgust of a great Austrian Jew, Theodor Herzl, with the anti-Jewish outburst over the Dreyfus Affair. He espoused, with feeling and eloquence, the thesis that nothing could save Israel but a Jewish State, a Jewish country. The idea swept through the Jewish world like a fire, and in a short time Theodor Herzl was able to stand before the Sultan of Turkey and offer to buy Palestine. The request was refused. Then Joseph Chamberlain, at that time British Secretary of State for the Colonies, offered to Israel a fertile and beautiful territory in East Africa—in Uganda. Herzl and many of his followers were enthusiastic; but a determined minority would have nothing but Palestine, and Herzl died of a

broken heart when the Zionist Congress refused the offer. The leader of the minority was Dr. Chaim Weizmann, a Russian Jew, who afterwards became Lecturer in Chemistry in Manchester University.

In 1917 the famous Balfour Declaration, favoring the establishment of a National Home for the Jews in Palestine, was issued to the world. The subsequent history of the scheme is fresh in the public mind. It has been dogged with alternating periods of hope and despair, and today its future is highly questionable. But even if it could have been a local success, the hopes placed in it as a solution for the Jewish problem throughout the world could never have been anything but an illusion. For Palestine could not have attracted anything but a small minority of world Jewry; the *diaspora* throughout the nations would have remained, and the Jewish problem is essentially a problem of the *diaspora*.

The Jews, to return to our argument, have a home nowhere. That brings us to the second solution—that since they have a home nowhere, they must have one everywhere; in other words, that it behooves other peoples, and especially Christian peoples, to receive them as their guests. But—and here is the crux—in what numbers and under what conditions of hospitality? That there must be, in the interests of the Jews themselves, some limits and some conditions the sad history of Jewry proves.

To claim unrestricted rights of immigration and unlimited liberty of action, as some Jews claim, is to ignore human psychology, and to ignore human psychology is to look for trouble. It is surely reasonable that the numbers and conditions of immigration should be regulated by the vital interests of both parties. It is not anti-Semitic to suggest, for instance, that in the interests of the Jews themselves, huge concentrations of Jews in any one town should be discouraged. It is obvious that danger lurks in a situation like that of

New York, where they form nearly one-third of the population. It is not anti-Semitic, but in the interests of the Jews themselves, to suggest that they should be refused a preponderance far in excess of their numbers in the political, financial, professional or educational institutions of the communities in which they live.

Humanly speaking, friction is inevitable if a community is liable to be invaded in great numbers by an alien body of great capacity and industry; and the only way to prevent that is to recognize the danger and act accordingly. We may not like such a solution; we might prefer if things were otherwise; but they are not, and it is a fatal error, as the world should know by now, to confuse what we should like to be with what is.

But it is not my province to suggest in any further detail the practical steps which both Jews and the Governments under which they live should take to improve the position. I need only refer to the wise solutions sketched by two great Catholic friends of the Jews: the late ever-lamented G. K. Chesterton and Mr. Hillaire Belloc. Chesterton's suggestion was that the cantonal arrangement once outlined for Palestine (some Jewish cantons, some Arab) might be extended outside Palestine; that, in a word, we should deal with Jews not as scattered individuals, but as groups—groups with special laws and exemptions (exemption from military service, for instance). Belloc, on the whole, agrees; but he is averse from beginning with legal changes and constitutional arrangements. He prefers to let the Jews themselves make the advances, appointing their own representative bodies and approaching the various Governments with definite proposals. But one or other of these methods imposes itself as the only *via media*, as the traditional Catholic middle path between the two extremes of Liberalism, which denies the existence of the problem, and anti-

Semitism which almost denies existence to the Jews.

ONE FOLD ONE SHEPHERD

Yet, when all is said and done, there remains a mystery at the heart of the question. I am acutely conscious that I have dealt, from the purely natural standpoint, with a question which is indissociable from the supernatural. Thousands of years ago God drew the Jewish people from the seed of Abraham as a people of benediction. They had as their supreme head Jehovah; as their legislator, Moses; as their kings, Saul, David, Solomon; as their prophets, Elias, Isais and all the seers who, ten centuries beforehand, foretold the wonders of the Gospel. And when the fulness of time was come, the Synagogue brought forth the Messias—but, after having awaited Him from the beginning, handed Him over to the Gentiles and refused to acknowledge Him. What now characterizes the Jewish people above all else is that it is still the people of expectation. But whereas before our Lord that expectation was its glory and its grace, it has now for two thousand years been its torment and its torture. The Synagogue, once the well-loved spouse, is now repudiated, and the Catholic Church has become the spouse of Christ.

But it is written that Israel will be converted and that to the period of misery and blindness will succeed a period of joy and light. In the meantime, we must extend the hand of fraternal charity to them as they stumble in their darkness and their blindness. We can only join with the Church in praying for the conversion of Israel, as she has done for nigh two thousand years. We can do little but prepare the festive table and await the return of the Prodigals. We are waiting still; but, some day not given to us to know, humanity will see the heads of both Jew and Gentile resting on the breast of the Vicar of Christ, their hands inter-

twined in friendship, all hatreds forgotten, the wall of separation broken to the ground, and there shall at last be one fold and one shepherd.

The Church, Democracy and the War

RAOUL DESVERNINE

Address delivered at the Twenty-third Annual Communion Breakfast of the Newman Club Federation of New York Province, Waldorf-Astoria, February 1, 1942.

WE HEAR it suggested in some quarters that the Catholic Church has failed in its appointed and professed mission to bring peace on earth; that with all its prestige and power, affluence and influence, it has not been able to win acceptance for the primacy of the spiritual or even to preserve the moral order; that it has failed to save man from his own destruction or society from its own disintegration; and that it has forsaken civilization and democracy by not championing one group of nations against another group of nations; by not becoming a political partisan in the present world struggle.

These would be discrediting criticisms if they were tenable; but they are wholly unsupportable, and spring from a fundamental misunderstanding of the mission of the Church, and the place occupied by the Church in the civil order, which, obviously, leads to a false basis of evaluating the conduct and accomplishment of the Church. Furthermore, our critics not only do not understand the true status of the Church in the civil order, but, unfortunately, many of them are even confused as to what democracy means to an American.

I, therefore, purpose briefly to refresh your mem-

ories as to certain truths, which should be "self-evident" to American Catholics, as to the American meaning of democracy and the Church's position in that kind of a democracy. In our restatement of these "truths," we will find conclusive answer to our critics.

Firstly: What is the fundamental postulate and essential characteristic of American democracy?

Democracy is not simply a technical form of governing; it is tied up with the ultimate destiny of man and of human society. It is a means subservient to these ends. Democracy is essentially a spiritual conviction, a political and social philosophy, a way of life. Being a way of life, it must be as dynamic and diversified as life itself; but life is more than mere force and motion, it has a created and organic nature, and a created purpose and destiny; and, consequently, it must function within the frame-work of its organic nature with the set purpose of achieving its prescribed destiny.

Many forms of democracy were known to the founders of our government, each form patterned to carry out a different way of life; but they selected the one which they considered the best adapted to carry out their particular political philosophy, and they had a clearly defined plan of life and rather concrete ideas of their destiny. They did not attempt to set up "a new order of society"; they simply erected a governmental machine postulated on the Christian way of life, which was the norm of Western European civilization of which they were a part.

They subscribed to the Christian concept of man as a person, which they considered the corner-stone of their political faith, and indelibly wrote that concept into our organic law, and set up a scheme of government designed to give full political expression to that concept.

Our Founding Fathers acknowledged the existence

and efficacy of "the laws of nature and of nature's God"; they declared man to be a creature of God, "endowed" by his "Creator" with certain unalienable rights and held that governments were instituted only to secure these rights. In a word, they believed in a personal God, in a divinely created and ordered universe, in the supernatural nature of man and that all essential human rights sprang from God.

The Declaration of Independence, which proclaims these principles and postulates our government on them, may be called the creed of Americanism; the catechism of our political faith.

Our Constitution gave political vitality and organic expression to this faith and our courts have followed the faith in construing and applying the processes of our institutions. Our civil rights, those specifically enumerated in our Bill of Rights, have no sanction or justification except in relation to this concept of man. It can be truthfully said that all of the rights guaranteed to us by our Constitution have their origin and are derived, not so much from law as from our own human nature and personal dignity. Liberty, the proclaimed birth-right of every American, only means the opportunity *in* man to exercise those rights which are essential to the perfection of his nature and the achievement of his individual destiny.

Our Founding Fathers also read the Christian doctrine of society into our organic law. They wrote that governments derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed." Christian philosophy teaches that man is by nature a social being, that is to say, he is impelled to live in society because of a natural need, fitness and inclination; and that the State is, therefore, a natural institution. It is a tenet of Scholastic philosophy that in the State authority comes ultimately from God through the people. The Church and State, therefore, agree in their concept of society and of government.

Consequently, our whole idea of government is determined by our idea of man; and what we get in government depends upon what we want *out* of government. It is as simple as that.

These postulates of our democracy found their root-source in Christian philosophy at a time when all Christians were Catholics. These postulates of the Divine Rights of Man are the Catholic contribution to the political philosophy of Western European civilization.

This concept of man as a person created in the image and likeness of a personal God, and as such having by Divine endowment the rights appertaining to his created nature, is fundamental Catholic doctrine, and is also the very essence and kernel of our American democracy.

We, therefore, see that the Catholic Church is the cradle of American democracy and that the Church and the American State have a common political faith.

I have dwelt thus long on these foundation principles only in order to crystallize in our minds exactly where and how Christianity and American democracy mesh together, and to show their common meeting ground in the political field. We must not be diverted from the substance of our political faith by an endless discussion of detailed and purely incidental laws, rules and regulations. They are of little importance if we preserve the vital principle of our institutions. If civilization is to survive the present world struggle, we must stop "double talk," and stop using meaningless slogans, and think fundamentally. We must have clearly in mind that our enemies and sometimes our critics use words as weapons; they use our own words — Democracy and Christianity — in other than our meanings, attempting to dull and defeat our minds. We must, therefore, be precise in our understanding and use of words.

If an American is not fashioned out of the Western

European man, the Christian man, he is philosophically a "man without a country." Those who reject the Christian concept of man and society are not merely anti-American; they are anti-our-civilization. If we want a test for determining who are our real allies and who are our real enemies, simply ask the fundamental question, "What think ye of man?" But this question must be asked of all nations, all races and all creeds. That's what we basically mean when we say that this is a war for *our* civilization. That is the postulate on which the Church takes its stand.

The Church will uphold any nation or the people within any nation, who profess the political faith which we have here outlined, and will lend its full support to any government organized in accord with the principles of that faith, no matter what its peculiar form or character may be.

Our critics must, consequently, be told to look to the substance—the real values of our civilization—in making their appraisals. The Church is the custodian and protector of what Chesterton called "The Thing"—our Christian democratic civilization—not of our geographical boundaries, our trade and commerce, our raw materials, and our political and territorial ambitions and racial prejudices—and its performance must be measured accordingly.

Having thus defined the substance—the fundamental hypothesis—of our democracy, we now turn to our second inquiry—Is the Church playing its part in upholding our democratic faith?

The best answer to this question is to be found in defining the true status and mission of the Church in the civil order. We too often fall into error because we labor under false conceptions as to the Church's role.

The Church seeks the sanctification of men and the salvation of their souls—not primarily man's economic and social well-being and political success. The Church

is, of course, concerned with the moral aspects of our economic and social processes as they affect man, and it has made its position clear and specific in condemnation of many conditions and many practices in the existing order. It also has been definite in prescribing the economic and social values and principles which should obtain in a Christian society. One only has to read two of many Papal Encyclicals—the *Rerum Novarum* and the *Quadragesimo Anno*—to see that the Church has been a fearless and wise teacher of “what’s wrong in the social and economic world of today.” The Church was the first expositor and advocate of social justice. It handed down the first indictments against the evils of contemporary society, and today the nations of the world are suffering the very penalties which the Church predicted.

The Church has always opposed, and does oppose, all political, economic and social forces which desecrate or degrade man, or which deprive man of an adequate opportunity to rise to his highest estate. It strives to better man’s “here,” so as to prepare him for his “hereafter”; but it does not seek to give man his Heaven here on earth. It knows that man cannot live by bread alone. It wants him to have the liberty and opportunity to earn the bread which his nature requires, but it also insists that he be given the spiritual sustenance which his supernatural nature demands. The Church is not only interested in the standard of living; it is also interested, and more interested, in the standard of *right* living. In short, the Church is concerned with the whole man—his body, his mind and his soul.

We must also remind our critics that the Church has a divinely appointed mission and not a man-selected mission. We, therefore, do not question that mission; we don’t try to reshape it to our fancies; we accept it as received and do our best to fulfil it. Furthermore, is it not presumptuous to oppose the Church’s revealed

wisdom and historic experience with our ever-changing human guesses? The commission given the Church was to teach *all* nations, not one particular country or a special group of nations, with which we happened to be in accord just at that time. The Church does not seek to save one nation and defeat another; it seeks to save *all* nations. Its mission transcends racial differentials, territorial boundaries, political parties and military and economic cliques. It occupies itself with the full content of civilization and the sum total of mankind.

Moreover the Church must be *right*—universally right—not just locally right and momentarily popular. We cannot judge it by the enjoyment of momentary and local popularity. History affords us many examples proving that the Church's foresight has been justified by man's hind-sight.

The universality of the Church gives it a unique and vitally essential function in the world today. Men cannot live harmoniously together; nations cannot live together in peace unless they are bound together by similar ideals and interests. There must be some unifying and cohesive force in the world to which men and nations can gravitate and be unified, otherwise chaos will reign supreme. The *only* unifying and cohesive force in our contemporary civilization is our Christian tradition and culture. We find it in our art, architecture, music, literature, history and philosophy and we certainly find it in our American political tenets. The Church has been the custodian and protector of that tradition and culture. We owe their survivorship to the Church's wisdom and the skilful care it has given to the authentic preservation of the one, and the aesthetic development of the other. The Church alone, amongst all the institutions in the world, can preserve this common denominator of life and it must not be criticized if it makes that its supreme function and the criteria of its action.

There can be no hope of peace on earth—no reason for a return to law and order—unless there remains somewhere on earth an authority which can again rally nations and peoples to common ideals, to belief in the same way of life and to hope in a common destiny. If the Church does not succeed in this our civilization is lost forever. We have no other institution to which to turn.

And this brings us to the situation confronting us today!

If we are not fighting for our Christian civilization, then the war is not worth fighting at all—or perhaps I had better say that if we are not fighting for our Christian civilization then we do not know what we are fighting for. This cannot be a war solely about a map, about raw materials, about racial and national ambitions, or even about the rectification of a treaty, for the simple reason that none of the belligerents have given us a statement of their war objectives respecting any of these subjects. We are fighting because we have been attacked; we are fighting because, consciously or unconsciously, we realize that our way of life, and the freedom which is implicit in it, has been challenged, and that there are those who are seeking either to destroy it or to transform it into something different—into what is commonly called a "New Order." As that "New Order" takes shape, we find that fundamentally it repudiates the Supernatural Man of our American Christian political faith, and denies the Divine Rights of Man, and offers us instead, or intends forcibly to impose upon us, if it can, the Omnipotent State dominated by "Supermen" who have constituted themselves law unto themselves, and who regard human rights as State franchises or their personal gifts. This is no exaggerated simplification.

President Roosevelt has said that we are fighting to defend Christian civilization, and, in his recent letter to Archbishop Mooney, he wrote: "We say win this

war and in victory we shall seek not vengeance but the establishment of an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule the hearts of men and of nations."

That statement sums up all I have been saying as to the role of the Church in the present situation. It is to establish "an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule the hearts of men and of nations."

Nations, even as men, can be governed only by force or by persuasion. Persuasion is the American method, and is the application of the Catholic doctrine of free will to the political process. The Church employs this democratic process and seeks the sanctification of men and the salvation of society by persuasion and prayer. Therefore, its real field of operation is in the minds and souls of men. The Church knows that you cannot use power politics to shove men into the Kingdom of Heaven. The Church knows that you can destroy the human mind and heart with bullets and bayonets; but that you cannot change the human mind and heart with bullets and bayonets. The Church knows that you can only fight ideas with ideas, power with prayer. And to win this fight, the Church must be not only *in* and *of* the world, it must also be *apart from* and *above* the world. The Church attacks and fends with the sanction of a purely spiritual and moral authority, not with the coercive power of a State.

It is fighting—it has always fought—in this field; and it is only in this field of combat that President Roosevelt's peace-aims can be accomplished—to quote him—"in the hearts of men and of nations." And what does he say are our war-aims—"to establish an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule." Indeed, I submit he has answered our critics.

My last word is one of admonition to our critics. Please remember that the Church has things belonging

to Caesar which it should render to Caesar, but that it also has things belonging to God which it must render to God!

The Character Aim in Education

WILLIAM A. KELLY, Ph.D.

AT the present time there exists a general conviction that character training has never been needed more, consequently the tendency is to stress character as the product most to be sought in education. This modern trend has had a gradual development, dating back to the early years of the present century and has been given impetus both by the chaotic conditions of present-day life and by the realization that modern education lacks something essential in the preparation of youth to meet the exigencies of the times.

The Colonists were men of deep and sincere religious convictions. Consequently when they established schools it was natural that the primary purpose of these schools should be to instil a knowledge of the fundamentals of religion and to train the child according to principles of moral conduct.

The outstanding characteristic of early American education was the recognition of the fact that character can only be formed by religious instruction and moral training. The expression of this unification of religion, moral training and education is best indicated in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 in these words:

Religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

The character aim continued to rank foremost in education during the first half century of our national existence. The schools throughout this period were religious in content and instruction and were denominational in control. However expansion, industrialization, urbanization and consequent changing conditions of life brought about a definite change in the middle of the nineteenth century.

As a result of agitation for non-sectarian schools the State assumed the task of providing free public schools for all children. These schools became definitely and completely secular. Religion lost its place in the curriculum and was excluded from the formal training of the child. Character formation, no longer the chief goal of education, became something incidental. Educational machinery was not set up to produce it and it was not incorporated in the procedure.

Since both the subject matter and influence of religion had been discarded, American education had deviated from its original purpose. The goals of education had become exclusively human and materialistic, lacking compelling purpose or value to give meaning to life. Good citizenship was sought in an adverse and materialistic atmosphere. Guided by a materialistic educational philosophy youth turned toward material goals.

The early years of the twentieth century were marked by a gradual re-awakening of interest in character formation as a significant goal of education. Formal recognition was given to this interest in 1918 when "ethical character" was included among the Seven Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education. This was followed within two decades by legal provisions in every state for incorporating the character aim and by specific programs in at least twenty-six states.

Events of the present day have inspired an intensive interest in character formation. Thoughtful people

are seriously disturbed by the chaotic conditions now prevailing throughout the world and especially about the possible effects of those conditions upon our own social order, economic structure, and moral life. The recognition seems to be dawning that upon the effective and enduring character of the individual depend the welfare and security of civilization. There seems to be a realization that the separation of public education from all religious influence, the complete exclusion of God have created problems of an acute nature.

This realization of the need for spiritual guidance and stability has been expressed in the newer programs for week-day religious instruction, for "released time," and similar plans for religious training. The very existence of such programs and plans constitutes evidence of the fact that character formation requires something more than merely providing subject matter suited to individual needs, something above and beyond the techniques of teaching and guidance. The existence of such plans and programs manifests recognition of the need for inculcating the principles essential for living life in a truly Christian manner, and affords evidence that the function of the school and its program must be re-interpreted.

While education has become "character conscious," so far it has been seeking only the externals of character. The essentials have been overlooked. Modern education, though realizing its obligations and seeming convinced that there must be inaugurated a universal program for character formation, is still uncertain what character really is, what elements constitute it, what are the adequate means and methods of attaining it, what objectives are to be sought.

The term character as it is used in present day educational literature has had a wide range of meanings attached to it. Consequently it has not been employed with any real precision. Yet among many of the scores of available definitions there seems to be a tendency

for two factors to appear consistently. These factors are:

First, character is an aspect or quality of personality.

Second, character involves adherence to principles which regulate conduct.

There is considerable confusion among educators concerning what personality is and from what sources the principles governing conduct are to be derived.

Personality means the capacity for being a person. However, the person is a composite of a sentient, material body and a rational, spiritual soul united into one life, one self which is the subject of all the states and actions of complete living. Personality, therefore, involves the expression and manifestation of all the powers, capacities, and capabilities of the person through thought, word, deed, and feeling. Because character formation is the process of developing, directing, and guiding the complete person the basic consideration in character formation must be a clear and adequate understanding of personality.

By virtue of his nature as a person, man belongs to four realms of being, namely, the physical, the mental, the social and the spiritual. Modern education has been much concerned with the training of man for his place in the first three realms. Yet it has neglected and ignored completely the fourth and most important, the spiritual training of man. From this neglect and failure has arisen the major difficulty which at the present time is preventing adequate realization and achievement of the character aim. Modern education is based upon a distorted view of the nature and destiny of man, of the meaning and purpose of life, of the relation of man to God and to the Universe.

Agreement on the aim of education is not to be expected while educators differ widely about the nature and destiny of man, about the meaning and purpose of life. The first step in the formation of character is

recognition of the nature and destiny of the child. The educational process must consider the child according to his complete nature not only the physical, the mental and the social factors but likewise the spiritual aspect as well.

The recognition of the spiritual element in man's nature is the very foundation of character formation. The fundamental element that underlies human existence consists in the dependence of man on God and his consequent obligations to God. This dependence, these obligations are expressed not alone in formal worship and service but also as a way of living in accord with moral principles. Religion provides the ultimate principles for life and conduct. Consequently, all that enriches and enhances character is found in religion and no true formation of character is possible without religion.

The most recent tendency in education has been to determine all objectives, curricula, and materials in terms of the "good of society." This is at best a vague and tenuous method of avoiding a definite and absolute standard of conduct. The inherent worth and dignity of man, the intrinsic value of each individual in the sight of God must be taken into consideration. The rights, duties, and obligations of the individual must be recognized, then he can be placed properly in society.

Furthermore, man is not merely a citizen of a particular state, a subject of a particular country. He is also a citizen and a subject "of the larger commonwealth of the kingdom of God." As such he is destined both for time and for eternity. Consequently, his education must prepare him for both. It must seek his best welfare in this life, his eternal happiness in the next.

No successful theory of education can ever be built upon the society in which man lives. It must be built upon the nature of man. Society does not make man

what he is. Man makes society what it is. Man's actions are governed by moral law and his value to society is his moral worth. Education is not merely a social investment, it is essentially a moral activity. Mere material readjustments of a social nature will be futile without moral bases. No mere addition of a course of instruction, no plan yet proposed will supply this need. In order that education may serve its proper function morality must be the motive permeating and pervading the entire curriculum, the content of which must be organized and presented as moral in essence and in purpose.

This leads directly to a consideration of the second factor featured frequently in recent definitions of character, that is, adherence to principles governing conduct. Principles provide the sources for motivating and the standards for guiding man's actions. Because of the nature and destiny of man these sources and standards must be something superior to man-made regulations. They are derived from the moral law and from Divine Revelation. Consequently they are moral and religious in nature. As such they provide the plan necessary for living life properly. These principles must be learned. Hence in order to be effective they must first be known and then acted upon and applied in life situations. Character then involves intelligent direction and purposeful control of conduct under the influence of definitely moral and religious principles which are converted into standards of action and which are adhered to in the activities and situations of life.

Modern education cannot supply the necessary directive principles because it is based upon the false and shallow "philosophy of change." Whatever principles it possesses have been derived from naturalistic, experimental, pragmatic theories. It finds adequate explanation for man's existence, and sufficient control for his conduct in natural forces, which are

necessarily material forces. It considers man to be essentially corporeal. It reduces mind and intellect to physiological functioning of the brain and nervous system. Consequently since all man's conduct is determined by these external forces and man has no spiritual qualities then there is no need for moral and religious principles. Thus the spiritual and the supernatural are rejected along with the moral law, the soul, and free will. God is left out of His Universe. So there is nothing permanent, nothing fundamental in modern education except "change." Enduring standards, unchanging principles, universal truths are ruled out of consideration.

Thus deprived of truly directive principles modern education asserts that man must determine his own world and to accomplish this turns to experimentalism. So it gathers facts, investigates, observes, and experiments to derive theories to meet man's material and social needs. When a theory is discovered to meet these needs, it is accepted. When present conditions change, however, new theories will have to be discovered experimentally and tested pragmatically. So truth is always in the making. "The constant reconstruction of experiences" makes it.

Modern education is seeking merely the externals of character. To accomplish this end it has included in its curricula every aspect of culture except the one source from which true principles are derived, namely, religion. Herein has modern education disregarded the essential of character formation. Character can be formed only when religious and moral principles function in such a way that they regulate the entire process of acquiring knowledge and skill, that they direct the child's interests and desires to worthy goals, that they guide his judgments, that they motivate his decisions.

The only certain way to achieve character is to base every thought, every word, every action, every feeling

upon the foundation of moral principles. This means that there must be an absolute standard for moral conduct. There must be enduring, unchanging principles, and universal truths to guide man in all the activities and conditions of life despite revolutionary changes in the social, industrial, economic, and cultural aspects. The outcomes of such education will be the trained mind, the disciplined will and therefore the moulded character which constitute the best safeguards against "political insecurity, social chaos, moral instability."

The catastrophes which have occurred, the chaos now existing throughout the world as a result of the present European war seemingly have provided an impetus in America to strengthen moral values. However, that strengthening will never take place while education remains mechanistic, while it ignores the existence of God, the reality of eternal happiness and the absolute, unchanging principles which govern man's life and conduct.

Today the character aim once again has come to the fore in education. Yet one vital lesson must be learned before that aim can be achieved. The essence of character formation is the training of man in accordance with his nature in order that, through righteous living, he may achieve the end for which he was created. The purpose of character formation is the perfection of human nature through the attainment of moral excellence. The basis for character formation is systematic training in religion so that it will function throughout the entirety of life. The only method of accomplishing this is the inculcation of knowledge of God, of His laws, of the destiny of man, and the training in adherence to the principles of Christianity in order to form the child in the "Image of Christ."

* * *

If you lead an interior life, you will attach little importance to passing words. **THE FOLLOWING OF CHRIST.**

Some Things New and Old

PANTHEISM

If God is everywhere throughout the created universe, why has the Catholic Church condemned Pantheism as a heresy? Surely, if God fills all creation, then Pantheism is just a convenient word for expressing that idea.

So it would, if Pantheism meant just the omnipresence of God and no more. Pantheism might possibly be a teaching acceptable to the Church, if it put into a single word that which is contained in the sacred text used as an Introit by the Church in the Mass for Pentecost: "For the spirit of the Lord hath filled the whole world: and that, which contained all things, hath knowledge of the voice." (Wisdom, 1, v. 7).

But Pantheism does not mean anything approaching that. It is a false philosophy which confounds God with the world, which teaches that God and the created universe are one and the same. The idea of this teaching is that God is in everything: that the stone is God, or the crocodile or the tree or man is God. And that, if you are going to follow it out consistently to a logical end, means that there is no such thing as a Personal God, nor really an Infinite God, because all creation is finite—it came into being and so can pass out of being. But God is without beginning or ending.

So it is easy to understand why the idea of the pantheists was condemned by the Vatican Council, which pronounced an anathema against those who declared that the Substance or Essence of God and of all things is one and the same. Pope Pius IX in his Syllabus of Errors equally condemned Pantheism, when he condemned the proposition that God is one with nature and subject to change, that God is identical with the created universe.

But this condemnation of Pantheism as a religious

philosophy does not deny the central idea of the Catholic Faith, that God is the source of all things. The Last Gospel at Mass makes that very clear: "and without Him was nothing made that has been made." (American Challoner-Rheims Revision). But because God is everywhere, that does not make created things and God identical, which, in a phrase, is what Pantheism aims at.

OCEANIA MISSIONS

How is the Catholic Church faring in the islands of Oceania, now that this part of the Pacific is involved in the war?

Nothing much is known just now as to the fate of the Church in these numerous islands of Oceania, except that one of the Bishops, an Irishman by the way, refused to leave his post, invaders or no invaders.

Conditions in the larger islands, the Philippines for instance, are pretty well known. But from the smaller missionary stations in these thousands of far-flung islands, only an occasional news item manages to get through to the headquarters of the missionary Orders working in those parts. Look at the maps in the daily newspapers to get an idea of the position. At Papua, Rabaul and in the Gilbert Islands there are more than 95,000 Catholics, who are ministered to by the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart.

The Marist Fathers work in the North and South Solomons, Navigators' Islands, Tonga, New Caledonia, Fiji, New Hebrides, Wallis and Futuna, where they have about 112,000 Catholics in their care. New Guinea, which has fallen into Japanese hands, is under the direction of the Society of the Divine Word with more than 50,000 Catholics.

In these numerous islands of Oceania with something like 208,995 Catholics, there are serving 400 priests, 220 Brothers and nearly one thousand Sisters. There are nine Vicars Apostolic in Oceania who are bishops, and one Prefect Apostolic who is not a bishop.